2139

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.--No. 17. NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 28, 1895. Whole No. 329.

> *"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!*
> *Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;*
> *And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."*
>
> JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Poor, pitiable Dana! It looks, after all, as if he would have to support Cleveland for a third term.

The editorial, "Dark Days," on the second page of this issue, was written and went to press before the passage of the bill authorizing the Venezuelan boundary commission, which accounts for its employment of the future tense in speaking of a thing which is now an accomplished fact.

Comrade Yarros has left New York, to reside hereafter in Chicago. But Liberty will not lose his invaluable editorial contributions. All our good wishes go with him to his new home. Measuring from the standard of real mental power, it is probable that the metropolis of the west gains more in the person of Mr. Yarros than in the last hundred thousand persons added to her population. Yet who knows that she won't hang him?

A few years ago by "political offences" were meant illegal acts committed by heroic and progressive men dissatisfied with government and ready to risk everything in the attempt to secure reform. Today, as "The Saturday Review" observes, so low is the standard of political morality in the world that glaring frauds, like those of Panama, are tacitly accepted as "political offences," because they are of the kind ordinarily and systematically committed by politicians. There is little indignation against political corruptionists, bribe-takers, thieves, and blackmailers, because the people have come to believe that politics are synonymous with [illegible] and that the honest politician is the rare exception. Indeed, when a political rascal happens to get caught and punished, he resents his treatment as a gross outrage, while the public at large is inclined to sympathize with him. Why punish one, when all are equally bad?

In discussing juvenile crime, the newspaper scientists trace the responsibility to the yellow-covered sensational literature. It appears that a lot of detective stories were found in the rooms of the boys accused of wrecking the mail-train near Rome in this State, and the conclusion is drawn that means must be taken to suppress all such literature and save boys from criminal careers. The "Evening Post," however, not only declares that the responsibility of sensational literature for juvenile crime is "a nice question," but goes on to assert that the talk about suppressing such literature by force is silly in the extreme. It says: "It is plain that government, when most paternal, cannot suppress the literary glorification of crime. Efforts have been made again and again in England to stamp out the 'penny dreadful,' but one home secretary after another has had to confess that it passed the wit of lawyers to draw a bill which would discriminate between, say, Stevenson's 'Kidnapped' and the 'bluggiest' Whitechapel hair-raiser."

A false climax was never more completely spoiled, a demagogic plea was never more neatly punctured, a confident orator was never more patly answered than at Cooper Union last Monday evening. "Who has profited by the Venezuela message?" asked Henry George, as he paced the platform with his usual know-and-own-it-all air. "The Wall street bears," he said, answering his own question. And continuing, he asked again: "Upon whom do the losses fall?" Of course, he was about to answer: "Upon the poor laborer;" but, before the words could leave his lips, the reply came from one of his auditors: "The bulls." Then even the Single Taxers burst into a roar of laughter, leaving their hero in an attitude of discomfiture. A single witty word had exposed the fallacious contention that the recent fall of stocks in Wall street had made this country half a billion poorer in a day.

When virtue and the pocket happen to be in accord, how truly moral and virtuous the great American press is! How it stands up for the Church, State, Family, Marriage, the Home, and all other great institutions of our Christian civilization! But, alas! what becomes of the virtue of the press when the pocket happens to clash with morality? A week or two ago a leading society woman of Boston, wife of a rich retired banker, eloped with a man ten years younger than herself. Owing to the standing of the "parties," the Boston press attempted to suppress the scandal, and, when that policy failed, the story was told, not as "morality" would seem to dictate, but as a brilliant and romantic affair. The virtuous editors did not dwell on the shock to marriage, the family, etc., etc., caused by this society scandal, but on the interesting details about the voyage, finances, and plans of the guilty lovers. Doubtless such a way of treating the event is more profitable than the old way of wailing, cursing, and gnashing of teeth. More papers are sold under the new plan, because people laugh at sermons of newspaper moralists and prefer interesting romantic "stories." But how about the interests of religion and morality, brethren?

A few years ago none but Anarchists and individualists of the radical type were prepared to advocate "free rum," not only as right in principle, but also as the most *practical* way out of the difficulties presented by the problem of the saloon in politics. Even men of pronounced liberalism scouted the claim that temperance would be promoted and blackmail stopped by freeing the saloon from all special restrictions and giving it the status of ordinary legitimate business. And what do we see today? Presidents of universities, like Seth Low, and high dignitaries of the church, like Bishop Doane of Albany, come out boldly in favor of propositions not far removed from the Anarchistic, and a large section of the daily press applauds their radical utterances. Bishop Doane would allow any man to sell liquor, and let competition regulate the trade in the same way as other trades are regulated by it. It can hardly be said that such men are converts to theoretical radicalism, but the facts of daily life and the logic of events have opened their eyes at least. A good deal of our progress is spontaneous and unconscious, and in this lies perhaps the strongest guarantee of the future. Many people will learn in no other school than that of bitter experience.

The postmaster-general again broaches the subject of an increase in the rates on second-class mail matter. He fails to see why one cent should be charged for matter the handling of which costs the government eight cents. It is needless to say that the newspapers are not so obtuse; they see very conclusive reasons why the present practice should be continued. The government, they say, indirectly educates the people by giving them cheaper education than they could obtain if newspapers had to charge higher prices, and, of course, any step which would lead to the lowering of the standard of general intelligence is to be deprecated. How the so-called individualist papers, which are so hard on avowed State Socialist proposals, reconcile this view with their professions of *laissez-faire*-ism, is not very easy to understand, since they take care to avoid the inconvenient difficulty. Those which make no professions of individualism might be asked why they do not advocate the extension of the practice to books. If it is proper that the government should help to spread education, why should it discriminate against books,—the best and most valuable means of education? There is no doubt that these newspapers would vigorously resist an attempt to reduce rates on books. They want no competition, and they want no "intelligence" save such as is derived from their pages,--a very inferior product indeed.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 28, 1895.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Dark Days.

Small as is the interest which American Anarchists usually take in questions of party politics, they have grave reason to feel the deepest concern as to the outcome of the quarrel that has arisen between Great Britain and the United States. The situation is to them a most deplorable one, in whatever light it may be viewed.

The least evil that can come out of it, now that matters have gone so far, is the subordination and postponement of those problems in which Anarchists are most interested, and the intensification of the difficulties of those problems by a large addition to the tax-payer's burden in consequence of the enormous expenditure for military purposes that is now inevitable, whether war shall follow or not.

If war follows, there will be added to this the greater evils of a tremendous indebtedness incurred for the prosecution of the war, an extension and a tightening of the money power's grip, another generation of pensioners to support, and a pervasion of all our institutions by that spirit of militancy and tendency to Archistic centralization which is always to be found at the heels of war and of which we have had bitter experience for the last thirty years.

If, with or without war, Great Britain succeeds in extending her possessions upon the American continent, then there is in store the greatest evil of all,—namely, the ultimate partition of this continent among the great European powers, and the consequent transfer, for a period without visible limit, of one-half of America's energies and resources from productive purposes to purposes that are at best defensive and at most destructive. Then the curse of militancy will be upon us in its direst form.

It will be seen that the outlook is a dismal one. Its brightest feature is that, of these three possibilities, the probabilities strongly indicate our escape from all but the first. If I read the future correctly, the *ex parte* commission called for by President Cleveland will be authorized and appointed, it will report adversely upon the claim of Great Britain, and Great Britain will then, less through fear of the United States than through dread of disastrous consequences in Europe, Asia, and Africa, either withdraw her claim, or refrain indefinitely from any attempt to enforce it. Meanwhile we shall spend millions for armament and defences, and shall be robbed right and left by contractors and politicians; and, until it has become evident that Great Britain does not dare to make a move, all the social questions of serious and fundamental import which are now pressing for solution will be held in abeyance by the masses of the people.

Whether the course of events shall justify my forecast or not, the quarrel is one in which Anarchists will participate only so far as they may be compelled by force. Their number is too small and their work is too important to warrant any frittering of energy in helping to settle the disputes of nations. But their hope in the present crisis should be, it seems to me, first, that England may withdraw her claim or submit it to arbitration, or, second, failing that event, that a sharp and decisive war may ensue to permanently deter Europe from entertaining designs upon America. In so hoping, of course they are moved by no spirit of patriotism, no belief in nationalism; by no feeling that the government of the United States is one that ought to stand; by no unfriendliness toward the English people, who are the most Anarchistic on earth, and by no *special* hatred of the English government; and, least of all, by any love of war, which is as hateful and abhorrent to Anarchists as it is damaging to Anarchism. Such a hope can be inspired only by an accurate appreciation of the appalling consequences to the entire world of a duplication in the western hemisphere of the militancy already prevailing in the eastern. Almost anything rather than that! T.

How to Help Liberty.

1. Send a copy of Gordak's poem in every letter and in every paper you put in the post-office.
2. Drop Gordak's poem, or other good advertisement, or literature, on the desks of libraries, or leave such in your car-seat. Always carry some effective pamphlet, or several, to hand to chance acquaintances.
3. Recommend the leading works of Liberty's Library to the committees of public and private libraries. A little tact is perhaps permissible here. You may speak of "Involuntary Idleness" as a solution, by a successful manufacturer, of the question of the unemployed. You might begin to speak of the great paucity of works exposing the monstrous heresies of Socialism; go on by saying that, inasmuch as Socialism, if not checked, will inevitably involve the most ruinous conflict of all time, it is undoubtedly incumbent on those who are entrusted with the control of public funds to do all in their power to combat the spread of this doctrine.

In recommending to library committees I quote Mackay: "Socialism is the last stupidity of mankind on the way to Freedom." I then appeal to them to help diffuse the light that shall have power to "scotch" the snake. The question of the unemployed is one that people prick up their ears at. In recommending "Instead of a Book," if you say that sixty pages are on the land question, one hundred and twenty pages on the money question, and all is a combatting of Socialism, that will be enough. I mean, the word Anarchism might be omitted. You might say it is an expression of philosophical Individualism. Always speak of an excellent index, and the fact that both sides are given a hearing.

Comrade Paul Camille sends me the above in a letter, telling me that the first part of it is an article he began to write for Liberty; but he sends it to me to "finish or put in waste basket." The trouble with my finishing his article is that he is here on his own ground, having had successful experience in this matter of getting books into libraries (as he has told me before), while I have not worked in this line. But my waste basket it shall not see, for it strikes me as good sense, even if I did not also know that it is well backed by the writer's experience.

Elsewhere in his letter he suggests that Mr. Tucker might get out a circular containing an "appeal to library committees," press notices of "Instead of a Book," etc. Mr. Tucker will doubtless be quite ready to do so if many express their willingness to begin work on the libraries within their reach. But don't wait for any such circular before beginning work.

I have sold three or four copies of "Instead of a Book" to persons of my own class,—that is, students and recent graduates from college. Such are often quite ready to look into the subject under its own name of Anarchism, and "Instead of a Book" is well recommended to them when you tell them that it is now the leading work on Anarchism. I recommend all such to any comrade within whose reach they come; they are good subjects to sell literature to, if they have any money to buy with; and the name of Anarchism should not be avoided in selling them books. I think the same will hold true for college libraries; but for public libraries my friend's advice is probably sound.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

The Illinois Labor Report.

The report on taxation lately rendered by George A. Schilling, secretary of the Illinois bureau of labor statistics, has received some attention from the press. It has been warmly praised by a few, and as warmly condemned by many. Fault has been found with the secretary for treating taxation as a problem specially concerning labor, and it is needless to say that the suggestions submitted at the close, particularly the recommendation of the single tax on land values, have given offence. Were it not for the single-tax feature, Liberty would pass over the report with a word or two of commendation for the clear evidence of corruption and inefficiency presented against the Illinois assessors and tax-collectors; as it is, a little more attention seems to be called for.

I may as well state at the outset that there is absolutely nothing in the report to warrant the apparently widespread belief that the facts and statistics gathered by Mr. Schilling irresistibly lead to the single-tax remedy. Mr. Schilling recommends this reform, not because it follows logically from his premises, but because he happens to believe in it, and there is nothing in the facts that clashes with it. What he shows is the need of *some* kind of reform in assessment and collection of taxes, and he naturally offers that plan which he, on other and indedependent grounds, regards as the best.

What the report shows conclusively is that there are systematic fraud and discrimination in the tax offices of Illinois. The "generalized results of the analysis" of the statistics are thus stated in the report:

First. The tax laws of the State are systematically

violated by fraudulent evasions and misrepresentations, supplemented by perjury.

Second. In a lawless rivalry between assessors to make the assessment valuations of their own localities lower proportionately than elsewhere, Cook county escapes a fair proportion of general taxes as compared with other counties, Chicago as compared with the remainder of Cook county, and the rich as compared with the poor.

Third. Through the assessment of buildings at higher proportionate valuations than lands, buildings in Chicago are taxed much more than land, which forces an undue proportion of taxes upon the poor and people in moderate circumstances.

Fourth. Discriminating under-valuations, indirect taxes, and tenderness toward landed interests in Chicago, besides overburdening the laboring class with taxes, are diminishing opportunities for employment, dangerously concentrating ownership of land, and generally promoting the interests of the very rich at the expense of the rest of the community.

Certainly *these* general results would never be represented as pointing to the single-tax scheme by anybody who did not favor it. Let us glance at some of the examples of injustice cited in the report.

Taking the tax on personalty, Mr. Schilling finds that the valuation has actually decreased since 1873 from about $287,000,000 to about $145,000,000, and, considering the natural growth of the State in wealth and population, and the enormous increase in the amount of personalty liable to taxation, nothing but corruption can account for the absurd disparity. Cook county, which contains Chicago and is by far the richest in the State, returns only $43,925 of taxable money,—an amount which is smaller than that returned by any one of the twenty-two more or less important counties in the State.

Real estate in Chicago is assessed, not at its fair cash value, as the law requires, but at twenty, fifteen, ten, and even five per cent. of the actual market value. How much property escapes taxation may be inferred from the fact that the tax valuation of all the real estate in Chicago in 1893 was only $123,745,000, which is much less than the cost of the buildings erected since 1873, to say nothing of the old buildings and the immense and constantly-growing land values.

The order of valuation in Cook county is shown to be as follows: (1) vacant land, 7.36 per cent. on the average; (2) luxurious residences, 7 per cent.; (3) business buildings in the centre of cities, 12.38 per cent.; (4) cheap residences 16 per cent. of the true value. Thus small merchants, home-owning workmen, and persons of moderate means generally pay more in proportion to their property than the rich.

Much is also said in the report about the discrimination in favor of unoccupied land and against improvements, but it is useless to cite illustrations of inequality and favoritism. No one has challenged Mr. Schilling's general conclusion that the practices under the Illinois system of taxation are scandalous and grossly unjust. But what have these facts to do with the single tax? Nothing at all. Mr. Schilling does not even attempt to connect the premises with this particular deduction. He presents, in his concluding chapters, some general considerations against any tax on personalty or realty, and makes an argument in favor of the economic advantages of the single tax. As there is nothing new in this argument, no comment is necessary. So far, however, as the facts in the report are concerned, they may be said to prove nothing more than the need of a more honest and efficient administration of the law of taxation. The evils complained of are all in violation of the law, which requires equality, fairness, and uniformity; hence the moral would seem to be that "the law should be enforced." Indeed, strictly speaking, the case for the single tax is weakened rather than strengthened by the proof of fraud and corruption. If Mr. Schilling could show that, notwithstanding a faithful compliance with the law, labor suffered from the existing method of taxation, many readers might jump to the conclusion that the single tax is the remedy; as the case stands, most people will naturally and reasonably remark that, before approving of a revolution in fundamental principles and practices, the existing system should be afforded a fair trial. This, in fact, is what the press *has* said *à propos* of Mr. Schilling's recommendation.

Fairness requires me to state that there are *some* facts in the report which bear directly on the question of the cause and ownership of land values, but the trouble with these is that they are totally unrelated to the main argument. Thus we have a profoundly interesting "economic history" of a quarter-acre in Chicago which in 1830 was worth about $20, and which, owing to growth in population, business, etc., steadily rose in value, so that in 1894 it was worth $1,250,000. Forty-two lots are described whose aggregate value is about $17,000,000. But, again, such facts do not prove the necessity and desirability of the single tax. If they did, we should all be Single Taxers, for every community has such economic histories of lots and sites. The question is not between the present system and the single tax, but between the latter and abolition of monopoly-rent through occupancy and use of natural opportunities.

A word in regard to the introduction to the report, in which Mr. Schilling. forestalling criticism, endeavors to prove that it is proper and necessary for a labor bureau to discuss the subject of taxation. After dwelling on the deplorable condition of workmen and the duty of the bureau to ascertain the cause of this misery, he goes on to argue that the chief cause of poverty is not vice, but tyranny, and that taxation is the chief instrument of tyranny. The following delicious passage deserves quotation:

> But it is not necessary to tyranny that the power of taxation should be formally lodged with a single person or class. With favoring systems of taxation tyranny flourishes in democracies as well as in monarchies. Though differing in its manifestations and more subtle in its outreachings, it may be none the less oppressive. It is the manner in which a tax operates, not merely the form of government by which it is imposed, that throws its influence upon the one side or the other of the boundary between liberty and tyranny. Parliaments, congresses, constitutional conventions, legislatures, and assessors may just as surely, though unintentionally and unconsciously, undermine the liberties of the people by their methods of imposing taxes as could the most selfish and cunning man among us if he were invested with despotic taxing power. As Prof. Ely says: "Taxation may create monopolies, or it may prevent them; it may diffuse wealth, or it may concentrate it; it may promote liberty and equality of rights, or it may tend to the establishment of tyranny and despotism; it may be used to bring about reforms, or it may be so laid as to aggravate existing grievances and foster dissension and hatred among classes; taxation may be so controlled by the skilful hand as to give free scope to every opportunity for the creation of wealth or for the advancement of all true interests of States and cities, or it may be so shaped by ignoramuses as to place a dead weight on a community in the race for industrial supremacy.

Does the reader appreciate the charming *naïveté* of this piece of reasoning? Tyranny causes poverty; taxation is the chief instrument of tyranny; hence taxation causes poverty. Now, it will not be seriously claimed that the inequalities and frauds pointed out in the Illinois methods of valuation and assessment are responsible for the poverty of the working-classes in that State, and we are therefore bound to infer that the poverty is due to the *failure of the State* to tax—land values! A tyranny which causes poverty by refraining from taxation is a startling novelty, truly. Tyrants generally prefer to act, and throughout history the grievances of the masses against tyrants have been that the tyrants have imposed burdens which could not be borne, not that they have obstinately declined to levy rightful taxes.

Of course I am fully aware that what Mr. Schilling means to convey is that tyrants have caused poverty by sanctioning and protecting land monopoly and depriving the masses of access to natural opportunities. Why, then, does he not say so? The cause of poverty is land monopoly (according to him), not the failure to tax, and the remedy is the abolition of the monopoly. A tax on land values may or may not (I say it for the sake of the argument) be an efficacious method of freeing natural opportunities and destroying monopoly, but the essential thing is the abolition of the monopoly. Knowing what the remedy is, the question of methods is secondary with us; we may have several plans, and the failure of one or more would not necessarily prevent our renewal of the effort to get rid of the evil.

Owing to his amusing inversion and circumlocution, Mr. Schilling has failed to perceive the want of connection between his facts and his remedies. Had he proceeded in a logical and straightforward manner, he could not have advocated the single tax in a report devoted to an exposure of relatively unimportant inequalities in taxation under present laws. On the other hand, had he written an open defence of the single tax as a solution of the poverty question, he would have had to deal with theoretical objections to the single tax, not only from the camp of monopoly, but from that of anti-monopoly. The report would be more valuable if it were more modest and confined itself to a study of the tax system which exists. The single tax has simply nothing to do with the case.

V. Y.

Bench Tyranny in All Its Beauty.

Goff, who owes his elevation to the recordership of New York to his share in the Lexow committee investigation, has brought down upon his head the contempt and execration of the entire press. Intellectually and judicially, he may be considered dead. He is a laughing-stock and by-word in the community. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the facts of the Langerman-Aub case, they may be

briefly stated as follows: A woman named Aub accused a man of having criminally assaulted her. On the trial, the testimony of a number of unimpeached witnesses, to say nothing of the story of the defendant himself, clearly established the impossibility of the woman's accusation. All those who heard or read the evidence were convinced that the woman's story was false in every legal essential. Goff, however, preferred to believe the woman, and, in a charge outrageously one-sided, unfair, and absurd, virtually directed a verdict of guilty. The jury, influenced and overawed by the prejudiced judge, convicted the defendant. A few days later he was brought for sentence, and everybody expected the moral Goff to impose a long term of imprisonment. Motions for a new trial were made and promptly overruled; and Goff tried to impress upon prisoner and counsel the eminent justice of the verdict and the irresistible character of the evidence which had led to it. Then he proceeded to read the prisoner a long lecture concerning his alleged past offences and vices, and denounced him in stinging terms as a moral leper and brutal criminal. When he got through and everybody expected the formal imposition of sentence, Goff startled his audience by the declaration that he had in his possession a written confession of the woman Aub to the effect that the prisoner was innocent, and that her testimony was absolutely false! With a dramatic air, he went on to tell the story of how the confession had been procured in private interviews between himself and the woman, and how he had, after a severe struggle with his conscience, decided to free the prisoner, in spite of his general vileness and wickedness. This was too much even for the Goff worshippers. His theatrical methods, his atrocious charge, his perverse blindness during the trial, and his illegal and gratuitous denunciation of the prisoner for crimes of which he had no legal proof and for which he had not been tried constituted a series of outrages which could not fail to arouse the indignation and resentment of everybody who had any sense of justice. The press not only of New York, but of the country at large, has been making it hot for Goff, pronouncing him totally unfit for his position and calling for prompt measures designed to put a stop to the numerous abuses and usurpations of which judges are guilty. Something may result from this agitation. Judicial lectures to prisoners may be discontinued, and charges to the jury may tend to become less biassed. Whether it is possible to reform Goff is rather doubtful. His is a case of a swelled head and inflated vanity, accompanied by a firm belief that the law allows criminals no rights which judges are bound to respect. He is doubtless sincere, but his instincts are those of a bigot and inquisitorial reformer. V. Y.

That Singular "Death-Blow."

Reading once more my recent article on the "departure" of Mr. Lloyd, I fail to find in it the tears which that gentleman seems to have discovered there. It was rather into a laughing than a lachrymose mood that his secession carried me. And so far was I from "posing as the hero of a moral solitude" that I distinctly disputed that I was in any danger of being left alone, merely adding that, even if I were, it would make no difference to my course. Does such defiance constitute a "pose"? If so, then Garrison, I judge, is to be considered a *poseur* because of the famous declaration with which he began the publication of the "Liberator."

Mr. Lloyd says that, in declaring that I have dealt the death-blow to philosophical Anarchism, he meant simply that the civilized world would never accept it. Precisely. It was on the supposition that he meant exactly this that I asked him the question that I did. And he does not answer it. That question was: if Mr. Lloyd considers my comrades and myself superior to the average of civilized mankind (I suppose he will not dispute that such has been his estimate), how can he declare so positively that the average man, as he grows, will not accept that which is already accepted by his admitted superiors? I am quite aware that it does not follow that he will accept it, but how can Mr. Lloyd be sure that he will not? We may be in error, but why may not our inferiors accept this error on rising to our level? Mr. Lloyd ignores this question, unless he intends as an answer his assertion that some things which theorists may accept will be rejected by the civilized world, if not for reasons which he considers good, then for reasons sufficiently effective. I can only guess at the meaning of this; but, as I understand it, the proposition is that, while Anarchists, by their greater force of intellect, are able to have a theory on this subject, even though a false one, while ordinary people have no such capacity, nevertheless the latter are so superior to the former *emotionally* that their feelings will never allow them to accept this theory. But I am sure that heretofore Mr. Lloyd has considered his former comrades (as a rule, and not excepting my abominably faulty self, since he says he loves me) superior to the average man, not only intellectually, but emotionally as well.

The real explanation is that, deny it as he may, Mr. Lloyd is angry and not in calm possession of himself. Were it not so, he never would have offered his old comrades the undeserved and wanton insult that he flings at them in another column, which I must characterize as the nastiest, meanest, most contemptible thing that Liberty has ever printed from one of its friends. I really owe an apology to the readers for its admission. Do you understand, my friends, what Mr. Lloyd says of you? He says that mentally you are my slaves; that you exercise no judgment of your own; that you believe what I tell you to believe; and that, besides having no judgment, you are so devoid of feeling that at my bidding you will advocate crimes from which men of the most ordinary type turn in horror. Do not think that I distort his language. Read it for yourselves in his letter. "Of course plenty of his readers will endorse him. So they would, had he advocated dynamite and arson." And by a curious happening this same man prints in this same issue of Liberty, in terms which leave but little of the English language with which to do justice to Shakspere, a tribute to the poetic, sympathetic, passional nature of one of those very persons who are ready to do murder when I say the word, my excellent comrade, William Walstein Gordak, who has written me a letter in warm endorsement of my position in favor of property in babies. But, Lloyd, I say no more, for I am sure that you are already disgusted with yourself.

Equally curious, when viewed in the light of Mr. Lloyd's prophecy, is the notable conversion to my position of the man who has been my keenest opponent in this controversy, Mr. Byington. "Not perhaps for my reasons," though for some of them, "but for reasons sufficiently effective," he announces that, unless some one shall afford him new light, he stands henceforth for the undisturbed control of babies by their mothers. Now, it is clear that Mr. Byington is not under the influence of my "personal magnetism and dominating personality." After fighting me to the best of his ability, and full of reluctance to accept my conclusion, he has succumbed less to my arguments, some of which he still disputes, than to his own independent reasoning. But, if Mr. Byington, why not others? Why not, at last, even the civilized world?

Since Mr. Byington erects his defences only to surrender them one after another to the Devil's Advocate, it is hardly necessary for me to examine his argument at length. If I were to assume that he intended to identify the arguments of the Devil's Advocate with my own, I might point out that I have never held that love of neighbor in the voluntary sphere ruins society, and that I have objected to it in the force sphere only so far as it impairs self-liberty.

Or I might point out that to show that a certain proposed policy would ruin society is not necessarily an appeal to sympathy, but may be an appeal to self-interest.

Or I might point out that it is no surrender of my position to induce persons to accept the contract by appealing to their gratitude, provided that in so doing I do not so change the contract that it will appeal less powerfully to the desire for self-liberty.

Or I might point out that the fact that not alone conflicting sympathies, but also differing views as to the application of the equal liberty idea, may lead to conflicting coercive associations does not make multiplicity of such associations an advantageous thing, but indicates rather that experience will teach the waiving both of sympathies and of doubtful applications of equal liberty in favor of more effective union upon the simple grounds where agreement has been attained.

Or I might point out that to use up the argument that one loves more tenderly a being whom he keeps in a state of helplessness by the exercise of superior force is not to use up the argument that a peculiar quality attaches to the love for an owned being who is naturally helpless through lack of force.

Or I might point out numerous other things. But I deem it sufficient, instead, to caution the reader to judge my position on the child question by what I myself have said upon it rather than by the defence of it which Mr. Byington puts in the mouth of the Devil's Advocate.

The main point of interest is that Mr. Byington has come to see that in this as in many other matters the evils of liberty are less objectionable than the evils of authority, and that

he has now enrolled himself among the champions of maternal liberty. After this no one can maintain that controversy is barren.

Let me refer, in conclusion, to the seeming contradiction between my dislike of the boycott and my use of it against Dennett. Surrounded by the abuses that prevail in consequence of government, I resort to the boycott on much less provocation than I would in a state of Anarchy. If liberty prevailed, the condition of the labor market would be such that Dennett could get no waiters to attend his prayer-meetings except those that really wished to pray, and so there would be no need of any boycotting. I am glad that Mr. Byington cited this instance, for it well illustrates the difference between him and myself. Among his reasons for wanting Anarchy is the opportunity that it will give him for a more thorough and effective use of the boycott in forcing his preferences upon others. Among my reasons for wanting it is the relief that it will afford me from the necessity of using the boycott as a means of hampering those who force their preferences upon others by powers which they owe to government.

Again I must postpone my reply to Mr. Badcock. T.

In France the extravagance and costliness of government have at last startled even the wealthy, and they are beginning to complain of the heavy burdens imposed on them by taxation. Statistics read before a scientific society show that one-fourth of the income of a well-to-do family is appropriated by the government in the shape of taxation. The organs of the wealthy are appalled at this showing, and there are some comments on the dangers of democracies. But what will the wealthy grumblers do about it? Will they abolish government? Their incomes are likely to diminish rather than increase in the absence of governmental protection of privileges and monopolies. Seeing that, directly and indirectly, the poor are made to part with their earnings in favor of government and its beneficiaries, the complaints of the latter strike us as decidedly unreasonable.

Of all the newspapers that have been roasting Goff, the Baltimore "American" deserves most credit for pointing one of the true lessons of the case in saying: "The result may be a change in the law so as to conform with the practice in Maryland, where in criminal cases the jury alone is the judge of the law and the fact. We would advise our sister State to adopt our practice." Many sapient editors actually thought that the case tended to discredit trial by jury,—as if the average juror could be expected to resist judicial encroachments and assert his rights in face of the numerous legal and traditional hindrances put in his way! Of course, if juries knew their rights, they could make themselves felt more than now, but from whom can they, at present, learn these things? Education, like charity, should begin at home, ignorant editors.

Recurring to the Lanchester case, "Justice" emphasizes its stern disapproval of "anarchic revolt" by individuals by adding the following remark to its previous expressions of resentment and displeasure: "Though we are as much opposed to the present marriage laws as a final solution of the relation between the sexes as the most vehement 'new woman' can be, we have the right to ask that the question shall not be publicly raised in an acute form by an official member of the Social Democratic Federation without any conference whatever with other comrades." Think of the fate of individuals under a *régime* pervaded by such a tyrannical spirit as that which dictates this rebuke? "Other comrades," it seems, are to have a veto power over the actions of all members, and to override this veto is treason. Let the collectivists obtain sufficient power to enforce such ideas, and the enslavement of the individual will be complete.

Religion, Civilization, and the State.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In considering the working of civilized government over savage tribes, the Congo Free State ought not to be overlooked, as being the only case in our time where philanthropic considerations have been alleged as the main motive for extending the white man's dominion over a very large body of savages. The "Missionary Herald" for December contains two or three items bearing on the work of the Free State government, all of which I here copy:

> Missions in the Congo Free State.—The "Journal des Missions" has an interesting and instructive article upon the Congo Free State and its relations to Christian missions. "This singular political entity," says the writer, "conceived by a king and made real by an International conference, is in the *moulting* process." Unfavorable reports are circulating through Europe as to the maladministration of its affairs, and the revolts which are provoked by it. "Stanley and his successors have sown the wind," affirms the "Journal"; "to-day they are reaping the whirlwind." Missionaries suffer everywhere for the errors of other whites. In reading the missionaries' correspondence from the Upper Congo, one is surprised at the painful monotony with which they write of the terror and aversion which *Bula Matadi* (Rock-Breaker)—the name given by the natives first to Stanley and then to the Free State government—inspires among them. . . . The Arnot Mission station was formerly at Bunkeya, where Captain Stairs was killed, in the south of the Free State. On the death of the king Msidi, the people scattered in all directions, and the three missionaries retired to the valley of the Lufira. . . . At length the missionaries, finding that the Belgian sphere of influence was narrowing more and more, that the country was becoming depopulated by the Arabs on their slave raids, and that there "would soon be more wolves than men," departed in August, 1894, to a place on the north shore of Lake Moero.
>
> The newspapers have contained brief telegraphic reports of the execution of an Englishman, Mr. Stokes, by order of a Belgian officer in the Congo Free State, under charge of selling guns and powder to the natives. The matter is a very serious one, and has called for diplomatic correspondence by British officials. This Mr. Stokes was once connected with the English Church Missionary Society, as a lay missionary in Uganda. He is spoken of as having much tact in the management of natives, and often conducted missionary parties into the interior. He withdrew from the service of the Church Missionary Society in 1886, and has been engaged as a trader, and has been well spoken of by the missionaries. So far as it appears, his execution by the Belgian officer was a high-handed outrage.

I have been asked what I claim to have shown, beyond the long-familiar fact that governments are faulty, by my comparison of savage and civilized governments over savage tribes. I seem to myself to have shown, by evidence that ought to be sufficient till rebutted, that civilization and Christianity make no better progress (other things being equal) under the government of the representatives of civilization and Christianity than under a government which pays no attention to either; from which I infer that government is not essentially in harmony with either civilization or Christianity. I seem to myself to have rebutted the common assertion that the advantages of civilization are due to the government of civilized nations, by showing that this government has no special tendency to raise up civilization when introduced among nations that lack it. I seem to myself to have shown that, when tried most nearly under the same conditions (that is, governing the same kind of people in the same kind of country), civilized government is not noticeably more useful than savage government. It being generally conceded that savage government is of little value, I infer that civilized government is not near the top of the scale of valuable things. If anybody can refute any of these points, I hope he won't be backward in coming forward.

Stephen T. Byington.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, Stephen T. Byington, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

It has been suggested to me that I might arouse more interest in the Corps by printing a monthly summary of results, instead of just noticing in a few lines that such a paper has printed letters.

The first trouble with pretending to give a full summary is that I have no material. Sometimes the targets given are papers that are not regularly seen by any friend of the Corps, and that do not send free copies to writers whose letters are published. Even when friends of the Corps learn of some slight success, they do not always send me word. I have this week received a copy of the "Saturday Union Record," containing my own shot and that of another member. I do not doubt that it has published other shots, but I don't expect to see them. For this reason I want it always understood that my brief reports in this column do not cover the whole even of the visible results of our work.

In the next place, the visible results are not usually very interesting to write about. Such a paper published such a letter,—that is all you can say. The letter does its work in readers' minds, but that work is not ordinarily accessible for report. To-day I received this in a letter from a Corps member: "I received a letter from J. H. Mockett, general agent of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Lincoln, Neb., in which he stated he had read my last article in 'The Voice,' wherein I alluded to 'Mutual Banking' and John DeWitt Warner's 'Emergency Currency,' and requested me to let him know at once where he could obtain copies of these little works. Said he was desirous of getting all the light he could on the money question." Such a report is interesting, and also instructive as showing how good it is to recommend literature in our letters; but such a report is exceptional. Our game doesn't generally write to tell us that it has been brought down.

We must expect, I think, to work mostly in the dark. We may be confident that steady work will tell, but we shall not usually be told of its telling. There will be reports enough of letters printed, etc., to assure us that our shots do not all fall into the sand, but there will be little more.

I am glad, however, to publish such reports as are sent in, and I should be especially glad to hear more of the score made on targets assigned to Section B. I know less of the work done by that section, because I myself write with Section A.

Target, section A.—G. O. Ellis, 30-32 Telephone Building, Detroit, Mich., wrote in the "Law Student's Helper" for October that "the law, whatever it is, should be enforced, and, if not right, should be made right." In a letter to one of our members he defends this statement by saying that, according to all historic experience, it is destructive to any nation to have people imagine that they can disregard laws at will; also, that people will demand less legislation if it is understood that passing a law always means enforcing it. The comrade who sends this in wants us to take Mr. Ellis's original statement for our text, and "hit him hard."

Section B.—"The Pointer," John Hale Larry, editor, 34 N. Main St., Providence, R. I., a Prohibition paper paying considerable attention to miscellaneous reforms. Show what are the bottom principles of reform, and how to apply them practically.

Stephen T. Byington.

Beelzebub Too Much for Mr. Byington.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I have no great exception to take to your description of me in Liberty for November 2, except that it is a little bit exaggerated. I have no plan for boycotting Sabbath breakers or "everything and everybody that is profane." I do, in general, boycott liquor-dealers, and would do so more thoroughly if I were freer; but I have for some time been saying (though perhaps not to you) that, if we had had Anarchy for the past hundred years, the present liquor problem would never have existed, and that would have been far better. So I am not conscious of being so deeply in love with the boycott as you make me.

At the same time I am a little surprised to find you so down on it. I remember your telling us that you kept up a one-man power boycott on Dennett's restaurants, and would go hungry a good while sooner than buy a sandwich of him, because Dennett requires his waiters to attend morning prayers daily. I had supposed that this was merely a way of testifying your disapproval of Mr. Dennett's non-invasive action; but I now learn that, when you boycott, it means a case of great urgency or gravity,—so urgent or grave, indeed, as I could not reasonably suppose the liquor evil to be,—for the boycott is to you a thing abhorrent, and your abhorrence can only be conquered by powerful reasons. So I feel that your warfare against Dennett's sandwiches must have some far deeper cause than I had thought.

As to the baby question, I have found it necessary to have it argued between the Devil's Advocate and My Own Advocate, as Mr. Lloyd did in the case of copyright. Please accept a report of their discussion.

My Own Advocate. If any woman puts her baby in the fire, I'll pull it out.

Devil's Advocate. That's your puritanism. You shouldn't let sympathy control your actions in such cases.

M. If I choose to love my neighbor as myself, what reason can you give why I shouldn't?

D. If you love your neighbor as yourself, and act accordingly, you'll ruin society, and thus defeat your own end.

M. Then you appeal to sympathy, after all, as the motive to deliver me from sympathy. You want me to refrain from lower expressions of sympathy merely as a higher expression of sympathy. But that is nothing against my making benevolence my supreme motive.

D. Of course you do as you like in that.

M. And Mr. Tucker himself appeals to sympathy and gratitude as motives in this very field where nothing but the "desire for self-liberty" was to rule, and then is astonished that I, as a Christian, don't agree with him. Why, I do agree, now that he has surrendered, and I said so beforehand at that very point in my last letter.

D. But, if you use force to satisfy your sympathy, opposite sympathies will lead people to fight each other.

M. Not much, if they agree that sympathy is to be expressed in harmony with Anarchist principles, and the only disputable point is what those principles imply. Most applications of the principle will be undisputed; as to the rest, you might as well expect fights from different views of the meaning of self-liberty,—for instance, as to copyright.

D. But I make the point that your sympathy will be satisfied better by letting babies be their mothers' property, because it will be better for the babies. For instance, as Mr. Tucker tells us on the authority of a man who speaks from experience, mothers don't now love their babies as much as they would if they felt that the babies were fully in their control, their own to do with as they would, so that, if they killed the babies, they would be responsible to no earthly power except their own consciences.

M. That argument, that helplessness causes love, or gives love a finer flavor, was used up in the fight against women's industrial emancipation, and is now so dead that the man who tries to revive it must be (as Mr. Tucker calls me) a most surprising ninny.

D. But, even if it is to make no difference with the mother's love, by assuming to protect the child against its mother you hinder the mother's caring for her child.

M. No, I don't, if she cares for it properly, or even if she injures it only slightly. I expect to step in only when she outrages it.

D. Are you sure? How about vaccination? If you are a vaccinationist, you must believe that in exposing the baby to small-pox without protection, and even refusing to allow you to give it protection, a mother is outraging her child as if she exposed it to the frost without clothing; while, if you are an anti-vaccinationist, you must believe that she outrages the baby terribly in vaccinating it. In either case, acting on your principle, you must interfere with her care of the child's health.

M. Well, what then?

D. Nothing, if you don't see anything.

M. Do you mean to say that the child's chances of being properly treated in this respect are better if its mother decides than if I decide?

D. N——no.

M. And, besides, the vaccination question is unique. There is no other point on which a similar dispute is likely to rise. This question is not of central importance even now; some day it will be settled, and leave no successor.

D. Hold on! here is the "Firebrand" reporting that the German Socialist Congress is considering a request "that they shall demand State prohibition of wet nurses, in view of the advantages of sterilized milk." Yet you won't have to go far to find plenty who would think it an outrage to give a baby sterilized milk when a good wet nurse could be had. Doubtless the next thing will be a law against mothers suckling their own babies; for I don't know why there shouldn't be microbes in their milk as well as in the nurse's.

M. Well, do you suppose the mothers of Germany know more about how their babies should be fed than the German Socialist Congress?

D. Yes——no, on reflection, I don't.

M. Have you any more of this sort?

D. Not till I read another paper. But I have a different one. You will stop a mother from spanking her baby when it needs it.

M. What do you mean by needing it?

D. When the baby is naughty and is spanked to make it stop doing wrong.

M. That can't be useful till the baby is old enough to understand the meaning of the spanking; and, when it is old enough for that, it is old enough, according to the principles in which we agree, to own itself.

D. Get me a certificate of that from a professor of infant psychology, if you want me to be as sure of it as you seem to be. But, allowing that in all questions of the care of children you may be expected to know as much as their mothers, which is absurd,——

M. I claim it only as to those questions in which one side may be regarded as positively outrageous. With that limitation it is not absurd.

D. Allowing it, I say, you still harm the baby in this way. The mother is better able to care for the baby in general than you for at least three reasons: she has a keen affection for it, she knows the family idiosyncrasies which it probably inherits, and she can give her constant attention to the care of this one child, or of a very few. You will take the child away from her because she treats it wrongly in one respect, and will put it in an institution to be cared for at wholesale by strangers. The general motherly care, of which you deprive it, is worth more than the individual error for which you separated her from it.

M. I won't take it away. I'll just punish the mother, if she abuses it.

D. Not take it away! Leave her to repeat the outrage! You came just in time to stop her, and you leave her to finish her work as soon as your back is turned!

M. I will take it away, if her action gives reason to expect that her treatment of it in general will be bad—not otherwise.

D. How if her offence shows gross disregard of well-known principles of medical science?

M. I think I would make that a question of degree.

D. You are in danger when you let your principle depend on a question of degree.

M. I know it; but I have to acknowledge that there is some harm to the baby in taking it away from its mother, while you cannot deny that there is some harm to it in letting its mother do anything abusive to it. Where there is undisputedly harm to be done on both sides, the question of degree must be raised. But I can afford, for the sake of the argument, to give you the benefit of all doubts on this point. If I never took the baby away from its mother in any case, but only punished the mother for abuse, this argument of yours would become entirely inapplicable, while I should still have (only in lower degree) all the advantages of restraining those mothers whose tendencies are abusive. In that way I keep my principle intact, only limiting the sphere of its application more than I had intended to do; and I am still free to take the baby away, wherever I can demonstrate that that is best.

D. Thanks for limiting the sphere. But, agreeing that sympathy may properly be a controlling motive in the use or non-use of force as well as in other things, and laying aside the question of what is best for the baby as one on which neither side is convinced——

M. You may not be convinced, but you had no arguments.

D. I make the third point that, in helping that baby, you are doing an injury of greater amount to the rest of humanity, with whom you ought equally to sympathize. For instance, as Mr. Tucker shows, you make the defensive association less efficient; and this is an injury, not only to yourself, as Mr. Tucker has it, but equally to all the members.

M. Well, let's see what Mr. Tucker shows. He says the association will be strongest when most inclusive. To my objection that it ought not to try to include vigorously hostile parties, he answers that my party will be broken down by a little experience, and then there will be only one. This is a barefaced begging of the question; besides, this is not the only issue on which parties may form. There may be parties for centralized and decentralized management; for high expenses with high efficiency, and for low expenses with low efficiency; for having the one association undertake the duties of both police and fire departments, and for leaving one of these to another association. A man of one temperament may be able to work best in an organization of one form, a man of another temperament in another; a man in one set of circumstances may be best served by one, another by another. If one association aims to be all-inclusive, members of each of these heterogeneous classes will try to have it adopt the policy most profitable to themselves, and the result will be constant discord and vacillation.

D. Eloquent, but not pertinent. None of these schisms can be brought into connection with our issue, except that which is made on this issue itself. You say Mr. Tucker begs the question in deciding this detail in favor of his argument, but you will equally beg the question if you try to decide it on your side. Neither party can score that point till the question under discussion is settled on other grounds.

M. No, I score it till the question is settled; for, as we know that there now are parties of these two tendencies, the presumption is that such parties will remain; and this presumption holds till it is positively shown that practical experience, or some other cause, will compel one party to yield its position.

D. But, while there may be no presumption before the end of the discussion that experience will settle the question in Mr. Tucker's favor, there is a presumption that experience will settle it one way or the other, and then the discord will cease. At any rate, if the weight of argument on other points is against you, you cannot oppose this point to it, for that fact will decide this point also against you.

M. As to my second objection,—that its power for self-defence will be lessened by trying to defend those whose defence is most difficult,—Mr. Tucker answers it by an argument which makes my motive in joining the association no longer "the desire for self-liberty" (or the prevention of crime against myself), but "the prevention of crime" in general, a regular missionary purpose. Since my objection was *ad hominem*, directed to Mr. Tucker's attitude on the question of motive, it is of course no longer applicable when he takes my ground on that question.

D. If you withdraw your second objection, you must also withdraw your fourth; and, as to the third, you cannot deny that Mr. Tucker is right.

M. I cannot refute him, you mean.

D. The net result is that, so far as concerns the purpose of this argument, that association is strongest which offers least obstacle to the membership of any one willing to join. All your successful cavils are against Mr. Tucker's attempts to extend the principle to a universality which is not requisite for the present application. So far as Mr. Tucker has a use for the point, he has it.

M. I acknowledge the corn, except as to that point of uniting opposing parties.

D. And that point reminds me that you ought not to set yourself up as an "opposing party," because discord is undesirable in itself, whether within an association or between neighboring associations.

M. My opponents ought not to set themselves up against me.

D. I must remind you that your opponents do not begin the fight, because they do not propose to interfere with anybody capable of fighting. It is you who, by attacking responsible persons, introduce discord. Your opponents simply take sides as allies of those against whom you have already declared war.

M. "First pure, then peaceable."

D. But, if purity is to be had at the expense of peace, that expense must have its weight among other reasons against using such means to get such purity.

M. Score that for what it is worth, then, and get back to Tucker's argument. He denies that he intended to oppose the cruel and the kind as classes between whom we are to choose (his emphasis on the desirability of the membership of the cruel was never essential to his argument anyhow), and then explains that the association will gain greatly in membership by letting mothers own their children, because loving mothers will be especially anxious to have their children at their mercy, for purposes which he doesn't specify.

D. Vaccination and wet nurses!

M. Still that applies only to such (necessarily a small number) as might wish to go against the judgment of a very strong majority. On the other hand, while it might be begging the question to claim the intelligently sympathetic for either side, the unreflectingly sympathetic will certainly be disgusted at the idea of not protecting babies; and these may easily be the largest of the bodies to be repelled or attracted.

D. However large a body the unreflectingly sympathetic may be, their numbers are certainly destined to perpetual diminution. The mother's desire to have full control of her own child applies not only to such as contemplate opposition to the known popular will on a point already in view, but also such as, contemplating the possibility of a future disagreement with public opinion, wish to be ready beforehand for such an exigency. The number of these is not necessarily small, or destined to diminish. Therefore, barring the intelligently sympathetic, your policy is sure in the long run to give mortal offence to more than mine would.

M. It may be so. As to the point of practical convenience and saving of labor, I acknowledge that Mr. Tucker has me there, and that your policy involves less difficulty than mine in its execution.

D. Thus, at every essential point, you concede the validity of Mr. Tucker's argument to prove that the association will do its work better and easier if it does not undertake to protect babies against mothers.

M. But I insist that this whole matter is beggarly in its insignificance. It will cost something, both to me and to the other members, to protect babies—granted; but it is worth far more than it costs us all.

D. Yet this waste of energy may add to the weight of an argument for rejecting your policy, if coupled with other reasons.

M. Certainly; bring on your other reasons.

D. Let me start with an illustration. You insist on your right to say whether children shall be vaccinated or not; you give up the idea of taking the baby away from its mother on this account, but you will still enforce your regulation by penalties on the recalcitrant mother.

M. And take the baby away too, if I think it important enough.

D. Now see what will come of it. To get the vaccination question finally settled on a scientific basis we must have plenty of facts regarding the experience of both vaccinated and unvaccinated people, to show what are the comparative results of the two conditions. As long as there are two parties in the field, we need to heap up more and more of such comparative facts, till one party is beaten down. That is the only way to rid humanity of the evils it suffers by the action of the party that is in the wrong. Now, by your regulation, you secure as far as you can that there shall be no experience in one of these two conditions. You also vitiate the records even of the experience that there is, for you present a powerful motive for the making of false reports in order to conceal disobedience to your law. There is no need of emphasizing the harm you do if you are in the wrong on vaccination, as of course you may be; but consider the results if you are right. You prevent some suffering to those particular babies on whose behalf you intervene, it is true; but you thereby prolong the life of the superstition which, as it would have led to their abuse, will lead to the abuse of others after you are dead. Thus you increase the number who are to go through the same suffering in future times, as many must at all times till this suffering shall have been done away by public experience,—the very thing which you are industriously repressing. In fact, the only way in which your object can be thoroughly and permanently attained is by the failure of your policy.

Now these same conditions obtain in regard to every possible point of the treatment of children. It is all an experiment, more or less; it is never absolutely known beforehand which way will be best for the child; but, when the experiment is tried, its results will be of value to all future children in increasing the degree of well-founded assurance with which their guardians will judge of the best course to take with them. The welfare of the race hereafter imperatively demands that we always maintain freedom of experiment: for adults, to experiment on themselves; for children, that they be left to the free manipulation of those who, when they experiment, do so with the greatest care to do all for the child's good. By undertaking to prescribe their treatment you are giving the children of this generation an uncertain benefit (for you may always have been mistaken as to what was good for them) at the expense of an absolutely certain injury to future generations of children. Furthermore, however great may be the injury to the child of to-day if he is ill-used, its effects will die out quickly; but, however small may be the gain to human knowledge from the observation of that treatment, the benefit of that gain will spread over all the children of coming time, and will be not only permanent but cumulative to the end of the world. Thus it is not possible that you should do as much good as harm by your repressive policy.

M. In other words, you want all children to be regarded as proper objects for vivisection.

D. I want them to be dealt with at the free will of those to whom they are presumably dearest, because we cannot in any case know that that may not be best for them, while we do know that the results of such a policy will surely be best for millions of children afterward.

M. If I don't know whether being thrown in the fire is best for a child now, I can at least make a very probable guess; and, as to the bad results dwindling, the earth through all ages will be deprived of the good that child might have done.

D. Do you mean that the world would be better off if its population had been ten per cent. greater throughout civilized history?

M. N—no. But, if the child is not killed, but brutalized, it will impart brutality to others who will hand on the contagion in turn.

D. Yet even social evil has a self-destructive power.

M. Greater than its self-propagating power?

D. Yes, in the long run.

M. I can at least interfere in those cases where I can be certain that the objectionable action was not good for the child or meant for its good.

D. I give you leave, for there are no such cases.

M. Then I can interfere with those cases which can have no possible experimental value,—that is to say, when the child is killed; for this puts the results quite beyond our cognizance. Indeed, every killing destroys a certain possibility of experimental knowledge, and thus is liable to all the condemnations you just now pronounced.

D. But you can never distinguish the results of malice from those of well-meaning blunders. If you try, the only result will be hypocrisy. The fact that you cannot discern a justifiable ground for an act is no proof that it has no such ground. I know whether I am being treated as I wish, and have that basis for repressing those who treat me otherwise. I cannot know whether a baby is being treated as it would wish if it knew what is being done. I cannot know what is aimed at, so I cannot know whether death is the intended result or the upsetting of the intent. Besides, it is not half so sure that a baby is injured by being killed as that it is injured by some other things.

M. Let the intent go, then. Leave unpunished what does not result in death, but punish what does so result.

D. Thus, for any action that may or may not be fatal, the penalty will be a lottery; fine justice!

M. Then—then—then—

D. Well, what then?

M. (*in the words of the Just Argument in Aristophanes*).

"I am beaten! O ye rascals,
Catch my hat--I come to join you!"

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A Free Socialist.

My statement that henceforth I was no Anarchist, but a Free Socialist, was intended to refer to my public profession. Having stated that my view of Anarchism was that it was the doctrine "that the invasion of one human being by another was in the highest degree wrong, foolish, dangerous, and inexpedient —that this *was* Anarchism and this only," and having, in conclusion, stated that my renunciation of the name Anarchist did "not mean any change of views," it, of course, follows that, although I reject the name Anarchist, I, in my heart, still regard myself as one.

I do not deny my own individuality or recognize Mr. Tucker's superior right of definition, but I do recognize his superior opportunity of impressing the world with the view that what he says is Anarchism is the pure article.

In spite of Mr. Tucker's very modest disclaimer, it is a fact, which no one knows better than himself, that he is "the accredited head" of "plumb-line" Anarchism. With his paper, his superior mental power, and his devotion to this one cause, it could hardly be otherwise.

Anarchism has now differentiated itself into three fairly well-developed schools,—Communist-Anarchism, "plumb-line" Anarchism, and "straight" Anarchism. I agree with none of them. With me Anarchism means no government, no invasion of one human being by another, and this only. Everything else is non-essential to it. But these three schools all, in my view, affirm government. The Anarchist-Communists make "no private property" their rallying-cry, and that means inevitably, to me, the government of the man who would himself retain and dispose of the fruits of his labor. I cannot conceive of individual liberty without private property. The "plumb-line" or "philosophical" Anarchism of which Mr. Tucker is the recognized head (pardon me, comrade, I must say it) affirms contract as the essential thing, and might as right, and therefore is logically committed to the doctrine that all outside of the limit are legitimate objects of government; that "slavery in Anarchy, instead of an absurdity, is a necessity"; and that children and fools are property. "Straight" Anarchism affirms absolute liberty without limitation, "the right to do as you please" unqualifiedly, and of course involves the logical contradiction that government is both right and wrong at the same time if two individuals will the one government and the other liberty at the same time.

It would almost appear that the old definition of Anarchism as "confusion" was not so bad, after all.

At any rate, while still believing in my private self, and willing to confess it to a friend, that I *am* an Anarchist, and almost perhaps the only sane one left, seeing that all recognized forms of Anarchy contradict the name and affirm government, I have no hope of being understood, if I use the name, and therefore drop it.

Perhaps Mr. Tucker is right that I shall be no better

understood as "Free Socialist," but I would like to try.

And the fact that I shall be "confounded" with Mr. Tucker still, if true, does not bother me at all. I am quite willing to be identified with him in all good words and works, and rejoice we can still agree on nine practical points out of every ten. I love and admire the man, in spite of his abominable faults, and feel the deepest gratitude to him beside. My taking a new tag will distinguish me from him as far as I care to be, and for the rest I am glad to go with him.

He may have taken the name Free Socialist once (and I hope he was one then), but the public has forgotten it. It will not be remembered against me.

Again the name Free Socialist suits me better than Anarchist. Anarchist is purely a negative term,—a non-invaded, non-invasive individual is an Anarchist, —and all that it implies is contained in the word *free*, but Socialist is a term under which constructive theories may properly marshal; for the essential idea of a Socialist is one who holds that society should be reconstructed. I am not merely content with downing government; I also like to plan and dream of a new social order on lines of liberty and coöperation.

Mr. Tucker cannot understand why his position should, at this late day, turn my stomach. But it is not so hard to understand. I did, indeed, long ago perceive where the doctrine that might was right and contract basic must lead. But Mr. Tucker did not, himself, make odious applications, and did not even seem to [illegible] what he now sees. So late as "Instead of a Book" [illegible] Comrade Gilmour showed him, he seemed not to perceive the logic of his position. Loving the man as I did, I hoped he never would make such applications, and kept pushing forward Natural Rights in the hope of destroying his main delusion before the evil thing happened him. Alas, it mote not be! The applications were made, the corollaries accepted, and there was nothing for me to do but what I have done.

The lachrymose vein he indulges at the close of his remarks on my "Departure" amuse me. His pose as the hero of a moral solitude rouses my poetic enthusiasm. It is admirable. I didn't think he had it in him.

But really I didn't mean to predict anything so dreadful. There is no danger of his being left alone. A strong man always has followers, and Mr. Tucker, with his personal magnetism and dominating personality, will not lack. Of course plenty of his readers will endorse him. So they would, had he advocated dynamite and arson. And what I predict is that, in proportion as his disciples endorse his views, will the civilized world finally reject them both. Of course I mean on this matter of human property. Not perhaps for my reasons, but for reasons sufficiently effective.

The doctrine of property in human beings may pass with theorists, but it will never be admitted to practice in anything bearing the name of free society.

J. Wm. Lloyd.

The Blazing Star.

I want to publicly thank comrade Gordak (comrade in a double sense) for his admirable poem.

A poem indeed, in art and form, in verse, thought, purpose, and passion, and truly great on a subject most difficult.

I would have been very proud of it, had I been capable of writing it.

J. Wm. Lloyd.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of

BENJ. R. TUCKER,

Editor of Liberty.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 524 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petty *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

Price, 15 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem." This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

Price in Cloth, $1.00; in Paper, 50 Cents.

PREMIUM OFFER.

Any person purchasing of the undersigned a cloth-bound copy of "The Science of Society" will also receive, free of charge, one copy of "The Review of the Anarchist Case," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull, and of "The Reasons for Pardoning Schwab, *et al.*," by Gov. John P. Altgeld.

Any person purchasing a paper-bound copy will also receive, free of charge, one copy of Tolstoi's "Church and State."

Mailed, post-paid, by

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it assails the morality superstition as the foundation of the various schemes for the exploitation of mankind. Max Stirner himself does not expound the doctrine of Egoism in bolder fashion. 30 pages.

Price, 15 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMpire, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH. Tune: Björneborgarnes Marsch (Finnish War Song). Words by J. Wm. Lloyd. Price, 10 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingalls. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS: Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBster. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW: Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 21 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.